

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 85.—No. 2.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 12TH, 1834.

[Price 1s. 2d.]



"As the end approacheth there will be everlasting choppings and changes in the Ministry."

## END OF THE WHIGS.

Normandy, 10. July, 1834.

THE news that has reached me to-day, has not at all surprised me. I always said, that if Lord ALTHORP were to quit his place, Lord GREY could not remain in his an hour. He was the soul of the concern, and he has appeared to me to have been weary of the concern for a long time. The excuse for the breaking up of this Ministry is a mere *excuse*. It is no one thing that has broken them up: it is the mass of difficulties; that mass, however, greatly added to by the mixture of laudanum and brandy, with a due spice of natural insanity, and a two-fold surplus of jaw. No Ministry on earth would bear up against this: it is the true receipt for destroying a Ministry and destroying a state. The people wanted a parliamentary reform, in order that it might ease them of their intolerable burdens. They prayed for a reform on that ground, and on that ground only. They did not want it for measures to pull down the church; for anything about corporations; and, above all things, they did not want it, in order that the poor, that is to say, the working people, might be stripped of their right to relief, and suffered to starve. They never contemplated an overturning of any institution whatsoever; and above all things they did not contemplate the creating of bands of commissioners to add to their burdens, and to make lying reports to calumniate their character. They did not ask for reform that twenty millions of money might

be granted to be given to mortgagees of West India estates. In short, they wanted a reform for precisely the same thing which the reformed Ministry had done for. This is, however, a horrible breaking up for the bands of liberals, who are cramming their pockets by the means of *commissionships*. What is to become of Wood, emphatically called John? And there is *pis-aller* PARKES. What is to become of the swarms of poor-law commissioners and church commissioners? What is to become of TUFNELL and JOHNSTON? If they had carried their scheme into execution so far as to have built one workhouse, they might all have been shut up in it, and been clothed at the public expense, in workhouse dresses. I do believe, that if this Ministry had remained in power quietly another two years, they would not have left us one single rag of English law to protect us. They seemed resolved to root out every law and every custom to which the people are most attached. They lent a willing ear to every projector whose object was to destroy any part of the old government of the country. We wanted none of their projects: we wanted our burdens to be lightened, and they took care not to do that. However, though it was excessively foolish in Lord GREY to have anything to do with BROUGHAM; though, as I told Lord GREY, when he formed his Ministry, that that step was sure to be fatal to him; though his difficulties have been greatly added to by the projects of this man; still I acknowledge, that it was impossible to go on with the present system: I mean *system of taxation and expenditure*. No man can overcome this difficulty: that system must be changed: in one word, my opinion is, that there must be a reduction of the interest of the debt, of the army, navy, and dead-weight expenditure; or that this form of government will be destroyed by a convulsive revolution. The nation is cured of all the nonsense about

Whig and Tory. Whoever are Ministers, if they ease the burdens of the people, they will stand: if they do not, they will come down. Sir JAMES GRAHAM and Mr. STANLEY resigned not upon that particular ground that was alleged; but because they saw the difficulties too great to get along with. They saw no chance of giving satisfaction to the people. They found themselves involved in so many projects: they found themselves deluged by such a torrent of quackery, flowing everlastingly from that exhaustless Scotch brain, that they were glad to wade out, and get to something like land on any terms. If there come a Ministry ready and willing to set seriously to work to lighten the burdens of the people, and to encourage them to hope for better days, they will be supported, let them be called what they may. What may happen, no man can tell; worse than that which was taking place, cannot well come. The bills before the House of Commons, and one just passed by it, must, if passed by the Lords, have produced most dreadful consequences. From these consequences we shall probably escape. At any rate, I am glad of a change; because it takes power out of the hands of BROUGHAM; and because it must break up his bands of all-devouring commissioners; and must put a stop to the scandalous job of emigration.

TO  
THE PEOPLE OF OLDHAM.

POOR-LAW BILL.

*Normandy, 7. July, 1834.*

MY FRIENDS,

THIS bill has now passed the House of Commons; and I deem it to be my bounden duty to lay before you the history of that passing; and also as correct an account as I am able to give you of the last effort which I made to prevent the passing of a bill which, if passed by the Lords, and attempted to be carried into effect, will, in my opinion, be productive of consequences of the most fatal description, as well with regard to the people themselves, as with regard to their rulers.

Upon the motion of Lord ALTHORP, that this bill be now read a third time, which motion was made on Tuesday, the 1. of July, Mr. HODGES (one of the Members for West Kent) moved, that the bill should be read that day six months; that is to say, to throw the bill out; his reasons for which motion he urged in a speech of considerable length, abounding with observations the most pertinent; he anticipated all the fatal consequences to be expected from such a measure; he insisted on the injustice of it; and, while he expressed his deep regret at being compelled to differ from Lord ALTHORP, he told him that it was his bounden duty to protest against this measure. Sir H. WILLOUGHBY, in a speech of considerable length, containing a commentary on many of the provisions of the bill, and descanting on those provisions with great force and great ability, seconded the motion of Mr. HODGES.

Mr. BENETT (one of the Members for South Wiltshire) spoke on the same side; and made a speech, which ought to have been heard, if possible, by every man in this whole kingdom. You will please to perceive, that one of the great means of delusion has been this; namely, that the people in *the north* are less generally chargeable upon the parish, than the people in *the south*; and that this goes regularly on, their being less and less chargeable from PEVENSEY in SUSSEX to the county of SUTHERLAND in Scotland. This fact is undeniable; and, therefore, it is concluded, that the poor-laws are worse administered in the south, where a man with several children, though in full work, has something out of the poor-rates to make up for the deficiency in his wages. "Oh, oh!" say the philosophers, "the poor people in the south are *worse off*, than the poor people in the north; they are *degraded*: we will prevent them from having relief in the present way, and thereby we will *elevate them to the high moral state of the people of Scotland*. They are ground down, poor creatures, by the farmers: we will elevate them by putting a work-house dress upon them; and by

"taking, even from the magistrates, the power of giving relief." Mr. BENETT, a very great landowner himself, and a magistrate also, of thirty or forty years' standing, well knowing that the people in the south were better off than the people in the north, took the pains to produce the *proof* to the House. He took the accounts laid before the House by the Ministers themselves. He took his standard of the yearly pay to a man with a wife and three children, employed in agriculture. He confined himself to England, including one or two counties of Wales: and he found the yearly pay of such man to be as follows:

In fourteen southern counties, *forty-eight* pounds a year.

In fourteen midland counties, *forty-one* pounds a year.

In fourteen northern counties, *thirty-six* pounds a year.

Mr. BENETT, to whom the whole nation is indebted for this statement, said, that he had in every instance given the turn of the scale to the northern counties; he referred to the returns on which he built his statements; and he challenged the Minister, or any body else, to question the accuracy of his statement. He had his statement upon paper, and he handed it to Mr. WHITMORE and other members who held opinions different from himself. He received no answer, and he could receive no answer. The jet of his argument was this: You do not consider the difference in the circumstances between the south and the north, the difference in the habits of the people. Thirty-six pounds may do in the north, where the people will live contentedly on a cheaper sort of food; but that will not do in the south. Mr. BENETT received no answer. A slight observation from Lord ALTHORP, that he did not know where Mr. BENETT discovered that men in the midland counties received forty-one pounds a year, seeing that they paid but nine shillings a-week in Northamptonshire was, in fact, no answer at all.

The defence of the measure was on this occasion the feeblest that ever was heard in the world. A very feeble at-

tempt to defend the emigration-clause on the part of Mr. WHITMORE, made no impression upon anybody. Mr. SLANEY (member for SHREWSBURY) insisted upon a *surplus of labour* in the country; and with regard to the superior management of the north, compared with the south, he cited as proof those riots of the south, which were not imitated in the north, in 1830. This induced me to rise; and it is my duty to lay before you an account of what I said in this my last most solemn protest against this bill. I shall not attempt to give you the report of my speech, about which, as a speech, I care not a straw; but I will state to you, as nearly as I can, the substance of the arguments and facts which I made use of. To give you more than the substance would be impossible, as it took me much about an hour to make the statement, which, I must do the House the justice to say, it heard with exemplary patience.

I began by observing, that I should not enter into any of the details of the measure; but merely confine myself to what I believed to be its *real ultimate object*, and to the showing that that object was unjust, unconstitutional, and that it contemplated an end which, if attempted to be enforced, must prove the subversion of the Government itself. I will now proceed to state the substance of this speech in the form of propositions, which, though very dry work, is very *plain* work; and affords the best possible chance of having one's meaning clearly understood. This is the most important subject that ever was agitated in this country in my time. This bill is beyond all measure of more importance than the Reform Bill was; its provisions come home to the very means of existence of every working man in the kingdom. Already we hear the angry voices of the labourers in the fields and along the lanes. Already their menaces are heard; a dreadful convulsion I verily believe is at hand, unless the Lords shall *take time* to reflect on this bill; and if they take time, I am sure that their wisdom and their sense of justice will avert this dreadful calamity from the country. I now proceed

to state the matter of my speech in the form of propositions.

THAT all that I should now meddle with were, the REAL OBJECTS; and the fatal CONSEQUENCES, if this bill should pass. That, however, before I proceeded to these matters, there were two errors to be swept away, both of which we had heard from the lips of the hon. Member for SHREWSBURY: the first was, the notion of a *surplus population*, or *surplus labour*; and the other was, the idea that the mal-administration of the poor-laws by the magistrates caused the riots of 1830, in the south of England.

THAT, with regard to the first of these, we had upon our table a report, made by thirty-seven of the greatest landowners in the House, having amongst them many gentlemen of great literary ability, and most extensive knowledge of rural affairs; and they stated to us, and produced evidence in support of their statements, that the lands of England had fallen greatly out of cultivation; that in some cases farms to a great extent were wholly thrown up to waste; that in other cases they were only half cultivated; and that in no case were they sufficiently cultivated; and were altogether much less productive than formerly. And, what is the cause of this? *The want of a sufficiency of labour bestowed upon those lands!* This also is told us by that committee; and yet (hear it all the world!) here are we sitting to contrive how we shall get away the labourers out of England!

THAT, in the year 1828 (month of July), the House ordered to be printed a report, laid upon the table by the hon. Member for SHREWSBURY himself, coming from a committee of which he was chairman; a committee appointed to inquire into the causes of the increase of pauperism. The hon. Member pushed all the witnesses upon the point of surplus population. Amongst others he had before him, Mr. BOYES of WALDERSHARE, in Kent, a great farmer, and a most intelligent and upright man, well known to all the members for the county of Kent. Being asked, "whether the labourers in his parish were all employ-

ed," he said, "that he had the mortification to see forty young men drawing gravel carts, like horses, that morning before he left home." "Well, then, you have too many people in your parish." His answer was, "that there was not a man too many; that they were all wanted upon the land; but that, owing to Peel's Bill and the weight of taxation, the farmers had not the means of employing them, and that the lands were falling out of cultivation." After this, to hear talk of a *surplus labour*; to hear talk of a *new colony*, with bands of projectors and speculators, leading farmers and labourers to their certain ruin, is really enough to deprive a man like Jon of his patience; but, at any rate, I do hope that the Right Hon. Secretary for the Colonies, who sits there, will not, by the flatterers in the newspapers, whose object is to plunder poor farmers and labourers of their little money, their health, and their lives; I do hope that he will not, by these flatteries, be induced to believe, that, compared with him, his two predecessors were obstinate, ignorant, and conceited men, because they refused to give countenance to these at once wild and greedy projectors; above all things, I hope that he will not be induced to give the countenance of the Government to these at once ignorant and unprincipled speculators.

THAT, with regard to the riots in the south, so far were they from having been caused by the mal-administration of the poor-laws by the magistrates, they were caused principally by the *hired overseers* created by SURGES BOURNE'S bills, which bills had taken the power of interference out of the hands of the magistrates; or, at any rate, had greatly limited their power. That, when I made a similar statement in the House before; when I ascribed the breaking out of the riots to the hatred in which the people held the hired overseers, and mentioned particularly the county of Sussex, I was flatly contradicted by the hon. member for SHOREHAM (Mr. GORING), who thought it becoming in him to ascribe the riots to *my speeches* and

my writings, and who trumped up the old story about THOMAS GOODMAN and his confession. That in proof of the truth of what I had stated, and of the error of the hon. member for SHOREHAM, I might refer to a great deal better and fuller testimony; but I would take the report of the Poor-law Commissioners themselves. At page 26, they inform us, that the labourers met throughout the rape of HASTINGS, and entered into resolutions, the first of which resolutions related to their wages; and the rest stated that *there should be no assistant-overseer!* At page 33, a magistrate, whose name is suppressed, tells us, "that he is quite sure, that there would have been no riot in the parish of BREDE, had it not been for the resolution of the labourers to *turn out the assistant-overseer.*" Some of them proposed to go to a magistrate to relate the treatment which they had received from this overseer; others opposed this, as they had so often appealed in vain" (N.B. Sturges Bourne's bill took the power of redress from the magistrate). "He is sure that they had no idea of a riot, for several of them said that they *would not mind being poor, if they could but be used with civility.*" There was *not a man of them who wished to do mischief*, but all were resolved to get rid of ABEL, the hired overseer." At page 57, of the same report, comes Mr. COURTHOPE, chairman of the magistrates, at BATTLE, during the riots. He, being asked for information respecting the causes of the riots, gives this answer: "The several causes of discontent to which I allude were, the reduced allowances from the poor-rates, principally effected by the *assistant-overseers*, which rendered them the first objects of attack by the labourers." Now, if I were in the place of the hon. member for SHOREHAM, I would at once acknowledge my error; but, whether he do, or not, wholly forgiving him on the score of THOMAS GOODMAN and his curious confession, I will say this; that super-excellent as the county of Sussex is, in all respects whatsoever; pattern as it is, to all the rest of the world, even to the

counties of England; surpassing, as it does, every other spot of God's earth, in able and adroit workmen, in cleanness of houses, cleanness of dress, neatness of gardens, manliness in the men, and delicacy in the women; still I am very far from saying, that this excellent and admired county, or any portion of it, is quite worthy of being represented by the hon. member for SHOREHAM.

THAT, with regard to this most portentous bill, which was then to receive the final decision of the House, the REAL OBJECT was, in my opinion, to reduce the people of England to the state of the people of Ireland; to make them live upon potatoes, at best; and to submit to occasional famine, in order that the landlords may put into their pockets, not only the amount of the poor-rates; but the amount of one-half of the wages which the labourers now receive. That I, by no means, imputed this wish to a majority of the landlords, or to any considerable portion of them, thinking them much too wise, as well as too just, to entertain any such wish; but that I most firmly believed this to be the real object of the inventors of this revolutionary project, and of its official supporters; and that, I would now, under the indulgence of the House, proceed to give my REASONS distinctly, one after another, for entertaining that belief.

THAT, in the first place, there were three countries, over whom this Parliament had to exercise supreme power: in one we found, in spite of all the fatal changes that immense taxation, and destructive monopoly, created by paper-money, had produced: we still found, generally speaking, the labourer, particularly in this reprobated south, lodged in a cottage, with a clean floor, with his bed up stairs, his little table set with a cloth upon it three times a day; that cottage surrounded by a neat garden, decorated more or less with flowers, containing a variety of vegetables, with a \* \* \*, situated in that spot dictated by decency, by native modesty, and by purity of manners and of morals. We have another country, where the labourer has earth for the floor of his dwelling; where

a few boards knocked roughly together form his bedstead; where his bed is *heather*, or straw, and his bedding the most miserable of rugs; where table cloth, knife, fork, or plate, never appears; where an iron pot, a *brose* (oats coarsely ground) bowl, and a bit of cow's horn for a spoon, are his only goods, furniture, and utensils. We have a third country, where all the household goods put together is a pot, wherein to boil the roots, upon which the family and the pig all live together, in a shed without a chimney, and covered with sods. In the first country all persons are clad from head to foot: in the second, a large part of the women and the children, have bare legs and feet; in the third, even the bodies of a large part are half-naked, and some quite naked.

THAT there is, perhaps, not another assembly in the whole world; not another six hundred and fifty-eight men, got together under one roof, who, having these three countries at their absolute command, would not set to work instantly and never cease till they had made the last two countries like the first; instead of which, we are at work to make the first country like the two last; or, rather, like the third; and professing, all the while, that we want to better the lot of its people. This is my first reason for believing that which I have stated to be true.

THAT my second reason is, the manifest insincerity which appears upon the face of the whole proceeding. The general instructions to the poor-law commissioners laid down this, as a rule to be observed, "that if the poor-rates were found to be *diminishing*, or even *stationary*, then it would be desirable "not to attempt to make any change "at all." A return lies upon our table, showing that they have *diminished*  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in England and Wales, during the last year. Yet the scheme is persevered in contrary to the professions of the schemers themselves. Here, therefore, there is manifest insincerity; and where you find that the professions are false, always suspect the real object.

THAT (as to my third reason) the

great stalking-horse pretence is, that, if the poor-rates be not put a stop to, they will *devour up* the land. Speaking in round numbers, there are eight millions a year collected by the overseers. Pretty nearly three millions of these are for county-rates, and other purposes, not at all for the relief of the poor. Not a word is said about the land being devoured up by *these*; not a word is said about *reducing the amount of these*; and yet these have gone on increasing *much faster than the rates paid in relief*. So that, if the poor-rates could be abolished altogether, here would be still something to devour up the land: this, therefore, is another false pretence.

THAT the poor-rates were never so low as they are now, in proportion to the taxes which the labourers pay. They have very much increased, certainly, within the last forty years; but what man of sense and of sincerity, will not ascribe the increase to the increase of the taxes, and to those fatal changes in the distribution of farms, which have arisen, not out of any change of character or manners in the people, but out of those injurious monopolies, created unwittingly by this House.

THAT these things are so well known to be true; it must be so well known to every man of common sense, that if half the poor-rates could be lopped off by this revolutionary project, nothing would be accomplished in the way of saving upon the whole. These things are so manifest to common sense, that one must conclude that there is something at the bottom, which has not been explained to this House, and which the projectors of this measure have thought it prudent to disguise.

THAT the bill provides for getting rid of the working people by taxing the parishes to send them abroad; that, in order to get a pretence for doing this, a circular question was sent to numerous gentlemen throughout all the counties of England and Wales. The question was this: "What do you think would "be the effect of an enactment enabling "parishes to tax themselves, in order "to facilitate emigration?" This question (Appendix, B. I. part 5,) is put to

1,717 persons, gentlemen, magistrates, clergymen, overseers; out of whom two hundred and one seem to approve of the project, seven hundred and seven deprecate it; great numbers say they have not a man too many; a considerable number say that they have not enough in harvest time; one gives an answer in the word "*horrible*," and nothing more; the rest either give no answer at all, or express their doubts as to the propriety of adopting such a project. And yet this emigration provision is contained in the bill; and a new colony is to be formed, and a company of speculators is to be formed for sending the farmers and labourers out of the country. This is another and a striking proof, that the projectors of this measure mean something that they dare not openly avow.

THAT the *distress of agriculture* is imputed to the poor-laws; and that, therefore, the bill is necessary to remove that distress; that this question, or rather these two questions: "Is the amount of agricultural capital in your neighbourhood increasing or diminishing? and do you attribute such increase or diminution to any cause connected with the poor-laws?" These questions are put to 1,717 persons, as before. With two or three exceptions, they all say, that the agricultural capital is diminishing; that is to say, that the farmers are poorer than they were. But, in answer to the second question, four hundred and one positively assert, that the poor-laws have had nothing to do with the matter; eleven hundred and twenty-nine ascribe the distress to other causes, and state that those other causes arise principally from PEEL'S BILL; while only one hundred and fifty-nine ascribe the distress to any thing connected with the poor-laws, or their administration; and of those one hundred and fifty-nine, FOURTEEN ARE ANONYMOUS, and two of them are *stipendiary poor-law commissioners themselves!* That here, then, we have the opinions of the noblemen, the gentry, the clergy, the magistrates, the most considerable farmers, the guardians of parishes, no measure of this

sort can afford relief to agriculture; that when, therefore, in the face of all this, we see this project persevered in, we must conclude that there is something at the bottom not openly avowed; and that something quite other than *bettering the lot of the labourer or the farmer* is at the bottom of the scheme.

THAT, however, in addition to all these reasons, which are founded on the evidence suggested to our senses by the nature of the case, let us see what is recommended to us by the papers laid upon the table by the noble lord. If the noble lord has not thought proper to give the House time to read these papers, or a fiftieth part of them, we are certainly at liberty to conclude that the noble lord had *read the papers himself*; otherwise it is, in reality, "the blind leading the blind." There are two commissioners of the names of TUFNELL and JOHNSTON, whose report I find in Appendix A. part 2. After telling us how the heritors of Scotland, assisted by the parish ministers, contrived to evade the Scotch poor-laws, and to reduce the people to the greatest misery, they give their noble employer this advice: "If then it can be shown, that in spite of these advantages, wherever poor-laws have been introduced, evil has resulted, it will go far to prove that the sound policy is to aim at their entire abolition..... That the very *basis* on which all poor-laws must be founded, the giving to the distressed a right to relief, is essentially *productive of evil*..... We would not be understood as recommending the IMMEDIATE abolition of the *English poor-laws*; we are simply desirous of stating the conclusion to which we have been led by the evidence, that ALL POOR-LAWS are in their *essence impolitic* and uncalled for, and that consequently their FINAL ABOLITION ought to be the *ultimate object of any change* that may be made; an object, however, that it is not supposed can be attained without being preceded by years of *careful preparation for it*.

"E. CARLETON TUFNELL.

"P. F. JOHNSTON."

THAT the noble Lord has certainly read this before he laid it upon the table; and yet I hope he has not; for, in another of the papers of these hireling commissioners, I find *myself libelled by name* seven or eight times. What ought to have been was this: the noble Lord should have read the papers carefully in manuscript before he laid them on the table of the House, and moved for them to be printed. I hope, and believe, that he did not read that paper which contains the libels on me; for, if I could believe that he deliberately procured the printing of these papers by the House, and thus effected the infamous libelling of me with impunity, I should speak of him and think of him very differently from what I hitherto have done.

THAT, however, with regard to this recommendation of TUFNELL and JOHNSTON, he shall not tell us, that this is not the ultimate object of his bill; he shall not tell us, that he means to stop with "*correcting the abuses in the administration of the poor-laws*"; he shall not tell us that he does not mean to abrogate them altogether, as soon as he can; and he ought to have avowed the object, and then we should have known what we were about. How stands the matter? The noble Lord lays a manuscript upon our table; by a motion he obtains our consent to the printing of that paper; he puts that paper into the possession of us all, as containing information and recommendations, upon which he asks us to pass this bill. And we find in this paper, that *all poor-laws ought to be abolished*; that their utter abolition ought to be the *ultimate object* of any measure adopted upon the subject; but that, in England there ought to be a *careful preparation* for that ultimate object. Now, are we not to conclude that this is the object of the noble Lord? Let him deny that this is his object; and then we will ask him why he laid that paper upon the table? But, in further proof, if any were wanted, we have the *recent promotion* of TUFNELL, who gives this recommendation. TUFNELL is, it appears, to be one of those

commissioners who are now going to Ireland, to ascertain what can be taken from the church there! Aye, and if there be any friends of the church present now, let them take warning; for they may be assured that one fragment of her property will not be left to her, if this bill be passed into a law. Put the circumstances together of TUFNELL, who is to go and decide as to the property of the church, and who is "*a student at law*." He was found to be a fit man for such a purpose, having given this specimen of his regard for the rights of the poor. His doctrines, as laid down in the paper which I have read, made him a favourite. His Irish commissionership is a reward for his Scotch report. To tell us after this, that this is not the intention of these projectors, is to insult us in the grossest manner.

THAT here are a sufficiency of REASONS for my believing, that the ultimate object is, to grind down the English labourers to potatoes and sea-weed; that, however, there is still another reason, which will, I think, make the measure run over. A barrister was appointed to draw up this bill; and it was necessary to tell that barrister *what purposes the bill was intended to answer*. It was necessary to give him written INSTRUCTIONS with regard to those purposes. He had such instructions given him; and those instructions ought to have been laid before the House; because the bill itself did not discover any ultimate intention; but it is boundless as to the power which it gives to the commissioners, who are to be appointed by the Ministers, and *removeable at their pleasure*. The commissioners are to take away all power out of the hands of magistrates, overseers, and every body else all over the country, and to make rules and regulations for ordering and governing the poor. It was, therefore, of the utmost importance that the House should know something about *the intentions of the Ministers*, as to what *sort of rules and regulations* will be adopted when they once got the bill passed. I had heard something about the contents of these *instructions* given to the barrister who drew up the

bill, and I wished the instructions to be laid upon the table of the House, but this Lord ALTHORP refused. When, therefore, I was stating my REASONS for believing that the project was to reduce the English to the state of the Irish labourers, I mentioned these instructions, and the refusal of Lord ALTHORP to produce them; and I added, "I have not seen these instructions; but I have seen a gentleman who has seen them; and on that gentleman's word, I can and will rely. Concerning those instructions I assert, positively assert, two things; and on the back of them, I believe, a third. First, I assert, that the instructions express, that it is desirable to accustom the people of England to a COARSER FOOD than they now live upon; second, I assert, that those instructions express an intention of establishing about two hundred workhouses for the twelve or fourteen thousand parishes; that is to say, FOUR TO A COUNTY, on an average. And, then, I declare my belief, that there is a POLICE FORCE to be stationed at every workhouse. This is my belief only, but it is my sincere belief, that it will be attempted." The noble lord may laugh at the belief; but he must deny the assertions, or admit them to be true; but I am sure that he will not deny them, without, at any rate, producing a copy of the instructions upon the table. POTATOES AND SEA-WEED are not MENTIONED in the instructions; nor is BROSE; that is to say, oats coarsely ground, and not dressed fine enough for very little pigs; these are not named in the instructions; but "COARSER FOOD" is named; and as the noble lord has several times said that he wants to bring the discipline of the north to the south, the brose bowl is the very best that the Sussex labourer can expect, if the noble lord can have his will. And, then, when the plan is ripe for execution, send your prowling commissioners into the villages of Sussex, and tell them that you mean that they shall live upon "coarser food": let the philosophers, by whom I am surrounded here, go and tell them that to

their faces! Let TUFNELL and JOHNSTON, who laud to the skies a parish minister in Scotland, who had saved the heritors in Scotland six shillings and three pence a week, by putting TWO old women and ONE old man to live day and night together in one room, for which he paid sixpence a-week; let the philosopher TUFNELL, who is now an Irish church commissioner, go into Sussex and tell two old women, that he means to put them into a hole with an old man, where they are to sleep and dress, and undress, and so forth; let him go and tell that to an old woman in Sussex; and if she have use of either arm or leg left, let him come back to the noble lord and give an account of his exploits. Let the feelosofers go and tell them at once, that they mean to elevate them to the "high moral state" of the Scotch, by giving poor old people "a penny a day," in the way of relief, or by sending them about to beg, with a beggar's license in their pocket and a beggar's badge upon their shoulder, as is done in thrice-happy Scotland, by the "generous" heritors, and by the "Christian ministers" of their several parishes. And if the stubborn-necked people remain unconvinced of the propriety and justice and mercy and Christian charity of this, let the commissioners refer them to the hon. Member for Middlesex, who, though not now in his place to answer me, will doubtless be ready to show, that the way to raise a "high moral character" in a people, and to make them "independent," is, to take away their right to demand relief, to give them a beggar's badge, to shut up two old women and an old man in a sixpenny room, to dress and undress themselves, and so forth, and to send them out as vagrants by hundreds into an adjoining country, and then to be taken back in caravans to be tossed down in their native country, there to starve.

THAT there now remains not a shadow of doubt, that the real object of this bill is, to put an end to the poor-rates, and to put the money into the pockets of the landlords; and, if there were the shadow of a doubt, it would

be removed at once, by looking at the monstrous provisions of this bill, which gives *six votes* to the landlord in the vestry, and enables him to vote *by proxy*. So, while he is voting for this hard treatment of the working people, without whose labour his estate would be worth nothing, he himself, like the Irish landlord; he himself is to keep out of sight, and out of reach; and throw all the odium upon his middleman, or his proctor! Ah! if there be any English landlord, who calculates thus, what an egregious simpleton must he be! It is easy enough for Scotch heritors and Irish domain-owners to be absentees. This abused south of England is a place of safe refuge for them; but whither is the English absentee to go, when become uneasy in his mansion?

THAT the object is clear from the provisions which so effectually take the poor-rates out of the hands of the farmers; that this is done, because the farmer knows, that by starving his labourers he would *only add to his rent*. Take off the farmer's poor-rates and his tithes too, and the landlord demands them both, in addition to the former rent. In Scotland the poor-rates are next to nothing, and there are *no tithes*. Yet, do we ever hear of English farmers *changing England for Scotland*! What strange fellows these English farmers must be! They are harassed, poor souls, with tithes and with poor-rates; and there is Scotland with neither; and yet not a mother's son of them will stir an inch. Plenty of them go to the United States, and a great many have been *fools* enough to go to Canada. And yet, there is Scotland, a better country than either, take it altogether, and not a soul of them will go across a river to get to that happy land; a river, which the Americans would call a "*creek*," or a "*run of water*." Why, then, they are the most perverse dogs that ever lived. Oh, no! It is not perverseness: it is common sense; that plain, unsophisticated, common sense, for which they have always been renowned. That tells them, that they cannot be, and that they ought not to be happy, unless those who till the

land have a fair living out of its produce; they know that tithes have existed in all times as far as they have ever heard, without impoverishing the farmer; and they know, above all things, that that which they pay for the relief of the poor and for the maintenance of the church, they would have to pay to the landlord.

THAT, having now clearly shown the *real object* of the projectors of this bill, let me now say a word as to its CONSEQUENCES. I deny the *rightful* power of this House to pass this bill. I know the House has the power; but I say that it has not the *rightful* power. A maxim of our law is, that an act of Parliament, which is directly contrary to the law of God, is void of itself. There is the highest authority for this. NOYES, in his maxims and principles of English law, has this passage: "If a statute were made, directly contrary to the law of God, as, for instance, if it were enacted, that no one should give alms to any object in ever so necessitous a condition, such an act would be void." I did not state this in the House. I had not then seen this passage; but, monstrous as it may seem, these wretched poor-law commissioners actually maintain, that all charity which consists of givings to the poor, is *an evil*; so that, if they be right, one of our first steps ought to be, to burn the Old and New Testament.

THAT, however, my denial of the *rightful power* of the House to pass this bill rests upon these grounds: first, that the right of the necessitous to be relieved by their wealthier neighbours is a prescriptive right, enjoyed at all times, and in all ages; that it is founded on the Divine law, and makes part of the very constitution of England. That BLACKSTONE, in his book on the "*RIGHTS OF PERSONS*," declares it to be the right of the necessitous to demand relief. These are his words: "The law not only regards *life* and *member*, and protects every man in the enjoyment of them, but also *furnishes him with every thing necessary for their support*. For there is no man so indigent or wretched, but he may demand a supply sufficient for all the necessities of life

"from the more opulent part of the community, by means of the several statutes enacted for the relief of the poor; a humane provision *dictated* by the *principles of society*." HALE, the severest advocate for the sacredness of property that ever lived, in remarking on the doctrine of the foreign civilians, and particularly GROTIUS, who maintains the right of the poor person to take from the rich what he wants to satisfy his hunger, or cover his nakedness: HALE, in observing upon this, concludes by saying, "that this never can be justified in England, *because*," says he, "sufficient provision is made for the supply of such necessities, by *collections for the poor and the power of the civil magistrate*." "Charity," says HALE, "is here reduced to a system, and *interwoven with our very constitution*. THEREFORE, our laws ought by no means to be taxed with being unmerciful for denying this privilege to the necessitous." Pass this bill and you destroy the constitution as far as relates to the necessitous. Obliterate the Act of ELIZABETH, as this bill in fact does, and the reasoning of HALE against the doctrine of GROTIUS falls to the ground: you dissolve the social compact, as far as relates to the working people. There must be two parties to an obligation: without protection on one side there can be no right to demand obedience on the other. Read the 28. chapter of DEUTERONOMY. You will there find, and in the next chapter, what is to be the fate of those who are the oppressors of the poor; amongst the number of whom I trust that this House will never stand.

At the close of this speech, I said that, which I do not think it proper to repeat here; but I am fully convinced, that all the consequences which I there described, will take place, in their most frightful form, and in the most extended degree, if, unhappily, this bill should finally become a law.

After a very neat, sensible, and impressive speech, from Mr. LEACH, member for West Surrey, the debate closed, Lord ALTHORP having spoken before

Mr. LEACH. The noble lord very solemnly professed, that his intentions were not to harden the lot of the working man; and he said, in the most serious manner, that, if he thought that the bill would have that effect, he would now abandon it. I cannot say, that I do not believe that he was sincere; because, his rank, his situation, all things considered, it seems to be impossible, that he should seriously have the intention of doing injury to those who perform the labours on the land; or, who perform labour of any sort in this kingdom; but, at the same time, I will not disguise from you, my friends of OLDHAM, that I believe him to have been worked upon by this band of projectors and false philosophers, until, as far as relates to this matter, he has been bereft of that sound understanding which is his great characteristic. His having a thousand times the sense of these Scotch quacks forms no objection to this conclusion. How often do we see men of the brightest talent, and of the best of qualities, misled by brazen and persevering fools! These quacks have but one object in view; and that is, to live upon public money. What care they for the lives which noblemen and gentlemen are to lead in the country. BURKE says, "Let a man tell you his tale every day for a year (whatever the tale may be); and at the end of the year he is your master." Lord ALTHORP is much about in this state.

His answer was really no answer at all. To Mr. BENNETT's statement; to some very striking statements of Sir H. WILLOUGHBY; to the speech of Mr. HODGES; to that of Mr. LEACH, he really gave no answer at all. He said nothing upon my assertions relative to the instructions to the barrister; he said nothing with regard to the recommendations of TUFNELL and JOHNSTON; he did not deny that TUFNELL was appointed to go and have a touch at the church in Ireland: he evidently felt himself abandoned by his immense majorities: he saw the House comparatively empty: he had a majority of about four hundred to about twenty upon the second reading of the bill, and he now saw

the whole House with less than half the number of that majority. When the House divided there were *a hundred and thirty-seven* for the bill, and *fifty-two* against it. I wish that I could give the names of the majority: those of the minority I here subjoin; and I shall always feel proud that I and my colleague made two of that minority. Mr. HODGES was the fittest man, perhaps, in the whole House, to divide it upon this question: his excellent character; his moderation in politics; his known attachment to Lord ALTHORP; his long and most extensive experience in country affairs; his admirable conduct as a magistrate, made him the fittest man that could have been found for this undertaking. Mr. ROBINSON, the Member for WORCESTER, made an excellent speech upon this occasion; and he very pertinently noticed, that the partisans of this bill found it convenient to represent its opponents as hostile to any alteration of any sort, in the management of the poor: when every man of us says the contrary; but, because we do not wish to strip the gentlemen, the magistrates, and the clergy of that, which more than all the other things put together, connects the people with them and them with the people; because we do not wish to overturn the local governments, which are in fact, the real governments of England, we must, forsooth, like "*parish-jobbing*," as they call it, a thing never heard of in eleven thousand, nine hundred, out of the twelve thousand parishes of England and Wales. BLACKSTONE and HALE both say, that the Act of ELIZABETH is interwoven with the very constitution of England; and because we oppose the nullifying of this Act, we are to be accused of being in favour of "*parish-jobbing*." SURGES BOURNE'S Bills ought to be repealed: they were a violent attack upon this part of the constitution. They did more to destroy the peace of England than any thing that has been done for a hundred and fifty years. Repeal those two odious acts: do every thing that law can do to induce the farmers to take the young people again into the farm-houses; then

you have done all that can be done, as to this matter, as long as the present load of taxes shall remain.

Thus, my friends, I have endeavoured to discharge my duty on this occasion. It was my duty to cause you clearly to understand the whole of this matter. My apprehensions as to the consequences if the bill should pass are such as I will not particularly describe, and such indeed as I could not describe without furnishing a handle for calumny to malignant persons. We will therefore wait for the event without expressing our wishes upon the subject. I can form no judgment with regard to what the Lords may do in this case. They labour under the great disadvantage of seldom or never conversing with men of experience in such matters. Those whom they listen to first find out the bent of their minds and then flatter that bent. I have no idea that any considerable portion of them (the *English* peers especially) wish to add to their incomes by pinching and oppressing the poor: they must know that it is not amongst the working people that the foes of either the peerage or the church are to be found. Amongst them they have no rivals: not a man amongst all the millions is there who can be said to be an enemy of their order. It is amongst the money-mongers, the upstarts of all sorts, the conceited, the theoretic crew who laugh at tradition and prescription and who are content with nothing that is six months old. If the Lords could hear the language of the *feelosofers* who are the real authors of this bill (the two bishops being nothing more than something to give a little respectability of appearance to the thing); if the Lords could hear *the talk* of these men when they are over the bottle, and could take a view of all the grand "*benefits to the human race*" which they have in store, they would begin to think that the sooner they stopped in following their advice the better. They would find that those who could thus sport with the rights of the poor are by no means nice with regard to the rights of the rich; but without driving their Lordships to the orgies of this philosophical

tribe, they may know that, of all the newspapers in London only one has uttered a word in defence of this bill, and they may also know that that one has boldly maintained the absolute necessity of **SPEEDILY REFORMING THE HOUSE OF LORDS!**

However, their Lordships must do as they like. Their choice is plainly before them; the act will be theirs, and theirs must be the consequences.

I am

Your faithful friend

And most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

#### LIST OF THE MINORITY

Of Fifty-two, Tellers included, who voted, July 1, against the Third Reading of the Poor-Law Amendment Bill.

Altwood, M.	Lister, E. C.
Altwood, T.	Lowther, Col.
Bainbridge, E.	O'Connell, D.
Balves, E.	O'Connell, J.
Baring, F.	O'Connell, M.
Blackstone, T. W.	O'Connell, M.
Brotherton, J.	Parker, Sir H.
Burrell, Sir C.	Potter, R.
Cobbett, W.	Rider, F.
Daffield, T.	Robinson, E. R.
Duncombe, Hon. W.	Ruthven, E.
Egerton, W. T.	Scholefield, J.
Faithfull, G.	Somerset, Lord G.
Fielden, J.	Spry, —
Fitzsimon, C.	Stanley, E.
Fryer, R.	Thicknesse, R.
Guise, Sir W.	Towers, C.
Gully, J.	Vigors, N. A.
Halcomb, J.	Vivian, Sir R.
Hulse, J.	Walter, J.
Hardy, J.	Williams, Col.
Hughes, W. H.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Humphries, J.	Wilks, J.
Kennedy, J.	Young, G. F.
Leech, J.	

Tellers.

Hodges, T. L.

Bennett, J.

Paired-Off.

Tennyson, Right Hon. C.

I have inserted below, from the *Times* newspaper, first a letter of a country magistrate on the Poor-Law Bill, which ought to be read by every man in the kingdom. That is followed by a letter taken from the same paper on emigration, which is equally well worthy of

attention. Next comes an editor's article from the *Times* on the Poor-Law Bill; next, the very important proceedings in the parish of *MARYBONNE*; and, lastly, an article in the *True Sun* in answer to what I said with respect to its writings upon the subject of this emigration scheme. Before these there is a letter from Mr. *LITTLE* on *Scotch Poor-Laws*, which Mr. *HUME* ought to read; and a letter from a gentleman who went to *Exeter Hall* and questioned the schemers upon the spot. I think I never have inserted in any one *Register* so much really useful matter as is contained in this.

#### SCOTCH POOR-LAWS.

TO MR. WILLIAM COBBETT, M.P.

Annan, 30. June, 1834.

SIR,—In the "EXTRACT" from the "REPORT" of the "POOR-LAW COMMISSIONERS" which appears in your Register of the 28. instant, these commissioners state, with perfect accuracy, that Scotland "*offers facilities*" for judging of the effects of poor-laws "*which are not to be met with in any other part of the united kingdom*"; because, as they justly observe, "*whole counties*" are there to be met with "*where the poor-laws have never been enforced*, and others in precisely the same natural circumstances where they have *existed for a century*." Thus far the commissioners are quite correct, and it would be vain for any man to attempt to contradict them, but when they proceed to report on the authority of what they call "EVIDENCE," that the "progress" of the principle of assessment in Scotland "*is marked by an evident relaxation of industry, by an increase of bastardy, by the forsaking of aged parents by their children, and by the gradual decay of the spirit of independence and foresight*"; when they proceed to report thus, it is clear that they have obtained their "EVIDENCE" only from those who were prepared to deceive, and very probably had an interest in deceiving them, and that they have in consequence been made the instruments of giving a sort of authenticity to a mass of (to say the

least of it) GROSSLY ERRONEOUS INFORMATION.

Of the *five* southern counties of Scotland with which I am best acquainted and which are of sufficient extent to form a pretty fair field for experiment, two, WIGTOWN and KIRCUDBRIGHT, are in the *first* positions mentioned by the commissioners, the poor-laws "having never been enforced" in them; *two*, again, BERWICK and ROXBURGH, are in the second position, the poor-laws having "there existed for (perhaps) a century," while the remaining one, DUMFRIES, is in a sort of *medium* state, the principle of assessment having been generally adopted in its *eastern* but not yet resorted to in its *western* parishes. Here then are two portions of Scotland which stand *directly opposed to each other* on the point in question, while in other respects there is no apparent difference in their "natural circumstances." But will the commissioners venture to say that there is a greater "relaxation of industry," a greater "increase of bastardy," more "forsaking of aged parents," and a greater "decay of the spirit of independence and foresight" in the counties of *Berwick and Roxburgh* than in the counties of *Wigtown and Kircudbright*? If they do, it is clear that, notwithstanding their pretended inquiry, they YET KNOW NOTHING OF THE MATTER. I assert, as I did in my last letter to you, that the fact is DIRECTLY THE REVERSE: I assert, without wishing to disparage any portion of my countrymen, that the labouring classes in Berwick and Roxburgh, though heavily pressed by the weight of general taxation, are not only in a *better* condition, physically considered, than the same classes in the counties of Wigtown and Kircudbright, but *more* industrious, *more* moral, *more* dutiful to parents, and *more* remarkable both for the "spirit of independence" and for "foresight." If any man dare to contradict me I CHALLENGE HIM TO THE PROOF; I call upon him, instead of appealing to individuals already committed by their previously published "opinions," to examine into the matter as I have done, with his own ears and

eyes; I call upon him to visit first the cottages of Berwickshire and Roxburghshire, and then the almost Irish cabins of Wigtownshire and Kircudbright; I call upon him to compare the condition of the inmates of these cottages and cabins in their food, their clothing, their household goods where the latter have any, as well as in their morals and general conduct, not forgetting to note down in which district most prevails the love of "ARDENT SPIRITS"; I call upon my opponent, should there be one, to perform this task, and if after doing so he shall still be of opinion that the commissioners have reported *well* and *truly*, then all that I can do is to pronounce him incorrigible.

But the commissioners, by way of supporting their doctrine, have hinted at a few of their *authorities*, and though their hints are very scanty indeed, I thank them for their condescension in this respect. They first allude to the REV. DR. CHALMERS and to his SCHEME for causing the "*aged, lame, and impotent*," of his populous parish in Glasgow, to be maintained by the *charity* of their *poor* neighbours rather than by an *assessment on the property* of their *rich* ones, taking care, however, not to let slip the secret that the reverend doctor, though almost sworn to live and die with his docile flock and to make them *happy* by keeping aloof the *odious English poor-laws*, ran away from them in a hurry for a little piddling professorship at St. Andrews, *just at the moment when his SCHEME ought to have TAKEN EFFECT!* They next refer to the REV. MR. MAC LELLAN OF KELTON, of whom it is enough to say that his parish, which is in Kircudbrightshire, lies in the midst of a district by far the most prolific in BEGGARS of any in Scotland! And their last authority to which I shall allude (for I know nothing of the proceedings of the REV. MR. MONTEITH OF DALKEITH and of LORD NAPIER), is the REV. DR. DUNCAN OF RUTHWELL, of SAVINGS BANK notoriety; of whom I have simply to say, *first*, that he is my near neighbour, and consequently well known to me; and *secondly*, that he is the *very man* who gave the certificate for BEG-

ging in favour of his "orphan" parishioners "*subject to convulsion fits,*" which was quoted in my last letter, and who, after giving that certificate, did *all the other strange things relative to the object of it, of which that letter gave a description!*

In their zeal to make good their favourite position, that "*all poor-laws are in their essence impolitic and uncalled-for,*" the commissioners founding, I presume, on the authority of Dr. DUNCAN, represent RUTHWELL as a parish in which, owing to the absence of an assessment, the people have never been "*degraded*" by a departure from the "*ancient Scotch economy,*" while of CAERLAVEROCK, a neighbouring parish, where the poor have certain support from the interest of a mortified sum of money, they say, that "*all the evils of a poor-rate have been created by the fatal gift of Dr. Hutton!*" From this, taken in conjunction with the general scope and tenor of the report, a stranger would naturally suppose that *Ruthwell* is exempt from *idleness and immorality*, while *Caerlaverock* abounds in those vices, and that while *want and misery* prevail in *Caerlaverock*, there is nothing but *plenty and happiness* in *Ruthwell!* Than such supposition however nothing could possibly be more erroneous. Both parishes are well known to me, so that I can speak with perfect confidence regarding them, and I assert, still challenging the contradictor if there be one, *to the proof*, and desiring him to come and take a look at what is called RUTHWELL VILLAGE, that, while *Ruthwell* is positively one of the poorest and most miserable, *Caerlaverock* is on the other hand one of the most comfortable parishes in the western part of Dumfriesshire, the condition of *all* the industrious classes, not omitting the *farmers*, being decidedly superior in the latter to what it is in the former! So much for the inference drawn from what the commissioners have been taught to style "*the fatal gift of Dr. Hutton!*"

Not having time at present for further comment, I conclude by remarking, that if the report on the poor-laws of England be similar in point of veracity

to the report on the poor-laws of Scotland, then Parliament is at present legislating upon a mass of misrepresentation.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. LITTLE.

P. S. Pray who is the Mr. "P. F. JOHNSTON" that signs the "extract" as to the poor-laws of Scotland? We know nothing of him here. I never heard of him before.

### EMIGRATION DELUSION.

SIR,—On reading your *Register* of this week, it gave me great pleasure to find that you were first and foremost in directing the attention of my fellow-workmen to the evil of this new emigration project of the political economists. Happening to get hold of one of their prospectuses, I was induced to attend a meeting at Exeter Hall. I found rather a large number of persons assembled, considering that it was held at a time when labouring men, persons best fitted for a colony, were at their several employments. I soon found, however, from the manner in which the claptraps, "*redundant population,*" "*profitable investment of capital,*" &c., were received, that there were but few working men present. That the company were composed for the most part of those sympathizing gentry who seek to remove the *effects* of evils, rather than inquire into the *cause* of them; and of those whose prolific brains are ever conceiving new fields of adventures for others to cultivate, for *their* profit and advantage. Sir, they managed their business in a novel, and I think a very cunning manner. The chairman would not suffer any observations or objections to be made, until what he called the whole of their plan was before the meeting, until all the persons elected for moving and seconding the resolutions had exhausted the patience of the meeting, when the resolutions were put and carried altogether. Previous however to this being done, I managed, with some difficulty, to put the following questions to the chairman, and as they have not yet appeared in any of the stamped papers, in the form I put them,

perhaps, sir, you will have the goodness to insert them in your *Register*. Mr. D. Wakefield, who I believe is a counsellor, professed to answer them (after he had put them in the form he pleased); whether he did so or not, those who have read his reply in the reports of the meeting, will, if you insert them, be enabled to judge.

I had no opportunity of replying to him, if I had, I think I could have shown the meeting that which he called answers were anything but satisfactory ones to the questions I proposed. Wishing you may live to enlighten and convince my fellow-labourers of the true cause of the evils that curse them, and that you may see and enjoy the fruits of your exertions, a happy and cheerful population spread over the cultivated gardens of England, is the ardent wish of

W. LOVETT.

15, Greville street, Hatton Garden,  
July 5. 1834.

To Mr. Cobbett, M.P.

#### QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN.

1. This plan is stated to be a "profitable investment of capital." Now I want to know whether this capital is to be *lent* to the emigrants at a *fixed and known interest*, or whether the capitalists are to possess the power (having once got the emigrants into a strange and distant country) of combining amongst themselves to give the *least possible wages to the labourer*, and thus reap the principal share of the produce of labour, for the use of their capital.
2. I further wish to know, what chance the poor emigrant who may accumulate a few pounds by his industry, will hereafter have, of purchasing a few acres of land, when agreeable to your prospectus, the capitalists of the colony and of Great Britain, have the power of buying up and monopolizing, whatever quantity they please, of the most productive and profitably situated lands.

3. You further say in your prospectus, that they are "to be governed by laws enacted expressly for this colony." Now I want to know what power the emigrants will possess in the making, or hereafter in the alteration of those laws, whether the labourer who is to enrich the colony by his labour, is to have his equal share of political power; or is it to be confined to *capitalists and men of property*, as in this country.

4. I further wish to be informed whether the capitalists who are or may be engaged in this project, will have the power of sending their sons and dependents to eat up the produce of the colonists, in the shape of governors, commissioners, legislators, bishops, parsons, teachers, excisemen, and collectors.

5. Further, if this be a plan in reality to benefit the working classes, and not a mere money-getting speculation; would not the same means and talents invested in a system of home colonization be productive of greater advantages, more especially as there are fifteen millions of acres of waste land in this country which could be profitably cultivated. For as it is an axiom of the political economists that land, labour, and capital, are the elements of wealth; it seems paradoxical to take labour and capital away from *so much land*, which *they themselves* admit capable of cultivation.

#### NEW POOR-LAW BILL IN THE LORDS.

To the Editor of the Times.

SIR,—The country, and more particularly that part of the country who have nothing to offer but their thanks, are bound to thank you most sincerely for your efforts in resisting and exposing the bill, which has now in its course reached the House of Lords, for revolutionizing the old poor-law system of the country. Permit me, sir, to join

you in so praiseworthy a task, and to offer through your columns some reflections which have occurred to me, who have for some time been conversant with the labouring part of the community, on the effects likely to be produced on their condition by the menaced measure.

But in the first place, will the bill pass? I fear it will, if great exertions are not made to defeat it, as I know great exertions are made to carry it through; and that not on the part of disinterested theorists, not on the part of political economists only, but by the most industrious and zealous of all partisans, by men personally interested in the result, by the expectants of place under its provisions, by the objects of the patronage which it audaciously creates and confers on the Ministry: for, sir, singular as the fact may be, I have no doubt that the late meeting at the large room in the Strand, for the colonization of Australia, is intimately connected with the anticipated success and the general working of the new Poor-Law Bill. The Poor-Law Bill will render the labouring population indifferent to their homes; and the colonization-men will be then ready to catch them and toss them on a far distant coast.

Sir, do not you yourself suppose, and still more, do not suffer the public to suppose, that this is mere surmise: the connexion in principle, and even in letter, may be traced and laid open in a manner so luminous as to banish doubt; for in a production of perhaps the most able, certainly the most theoretic of the poor-law commissioners, Mr. Senior, published some two years ago, is the following passage: "Emigration is not only the sole immediate remedy. but is a remedy preparatory to the adoption, and necessary to the safety of every other"; and further, in a report on the poor-laws, dated June 30, 1819, by a committee, of which Mr. Sturges Bourne was chairman, (as he is also one of the members of the poor-law commission), is to be found the following passage:

"Your committee would anxiously

"direct the future attention of the House to such measures as may be calculated ultimately to relieve parishes from the impracticable obligation of finding employment for all who may at any time require it at their hands, and to confine the relief derived from compulsory assessments to 'the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such other among them being poor, and not able to work.'" The committee also recommend, "that all obstacles to seeking employment, wherever it can be found, even out of the realm, should be removed; and every facility that is reasonable afforded to those who may wish to resort to some of our own colonies."

It is clear, therefore, sir, emigration—I must say, for I shall immediately prove it, compulsory emigration—is the soul and object of the new or revolutionary Poor-Law Bill; and that in addition to the patronage at home which it originates, as commissioners, sub-commissioners, perhaps also travelling architects and surveyors, for the construction of the new workhouses, we shall have to provide for governors abroad (with their secretaries and other underlings) of the colonized regions. I have already heard the name of a future governor of Australia mentioned, a writer on political economy, and of course a warm advocate of the present plan: he is also a member of Parliament. But I maintain, sir, that the emigration contemplated, and in reality enforced, by the bill, is, and is meant to be, compulsory. For what does the bill say? That able-bodied men for whom work cannot be found in their several parishes, and who cannot in consequence maintain themselves and their families, are not to be relieved but with the consent of the commissioners, except in the new district workhouses. View such men, therefore, immured in these workhouses. The human mind would despair, the human frame would sink, under such confinement, in healthy subjects, if there were no hope of liberation. But there is a hope of liberation; the prisoners need not stop a day longer than they please; Australia offers

them its hospitable shores and boundless plains; they will be conveyed thither free of expense. Is it not clearly therefore the object of the bill,—is it not the avowed opinion of all those on whose recommendation the bill has been framed,—that the British labourers, of whom these political economists say there is a redundancy, should be forced to seek an escape from prison by for ever quitting their native land? Now we see what is meant by Mr. Senior's expression above quoted—"that emigration is not only the sole remedy, but it is a remedy preparatory to the adoption, and necessary to the safety of every other." Extreme pressure is to be created on the poor, and emigration is the safety-valve.

I have spoken above of my apprehensions that the bill may pass; but the Chancellor, I think, has applied an argument that may cut both ways. He has indicated the necessity of passing the bill, in order absolutely to preserve the Peers "in possession of their estates." But is there no fear of what an inflamed population may do—the destruction of property? He has said that it "would conduce little to deliberation, little to enlightenment, to open their ears to all the representations which might reach them from parish jobbers and country agitators." What have "parish jobbers or agitators" to gain, I ask, by any representations they may make to the Peers during the recess of Parliament? Nothing whatever. But can the same question be asked and answered in the same manner with respect to those gentlemen upon whose recommendation the bill has been brought in? They have something to gain, and one place creates many expectants. The motives for which they press its execution are obviously personal and selfish. Is it not also degrading to the Peers to have it recommended to them as a motive for passing a bill, that whatever may be its effect upon the country, they thereby serve their own interests best?

Still, sir, I am not without hopes of the Peers with respect to this most ominous bill. Delay in such a case is

gain; and I find the Peers bound by a report of one of their own committees, in which they acquiesced, not to pass a bill of this magnitude at so late a period of the session, and when Parliament cannot be sitting to watch its progress and operation in the country.

The following extract from a report of the Lords' Committee on the poor-laws in 1817 will explain what I mean:

"The advanced period of the session will of course preclude the possibility of any immediate alteration in the present laws; but, so far from considering this circumstance as a matter of regret, the committee are of opinion that more advantage will ultimately arise from affording time for deliberation upon the different suggestions which have been made, than from hastily adopting alterations, which, however useful they may at present appear, might possibly hereafter in the detail be found inconsistent with a more general plan of improvement in the system itself."

Now, sir, I do not know at this moment, nor is it worth the while to inquire what was the nature of the change in the poor-laws which was then under the consideration of their lordships: suffice it to say, that it could not be of a twentieth part of the magnitude and importance of that which is now proposed; and I must maintain, therefore, that they are bound by the tenour of the preceding extract to suspend the measure now first introduced to them in the month of July, 1834, when they found themselves restrained from entertaining a measure of much less consequence on the same subject at so late a period of the session as the month of July, 1817. Nor is this all: for I find their lordships bound also, by a report of the same committee, to reject totally and finally any measure of so portentous a nature as that which is now offered to their acceptance. I humbly entreat the attention of their lordships to the following extract from the report of the same committee:

"From lapse of time and a departure from the true spirit of the act of '43

"Elizabeth, arising frequently from the humane exercise of its supposed powers, abuses have undoubtedly been introduced into the general administration of the poor-laws of England; but the committee are nevertheless decidedly of opinion, that the general system of those laws, interwoven as it is with the habits of the people, ought, in the consideration of any measures to be adopted for their melioration and improvement, to be ESSENTIALLY MAINTAINED."

This, sir, I say, is a direct condemnation of the measure now before the Lords; and I must hope, therefore, that while there is consistency in that assembly, such a measure can neither finally be carried even in the next session of Parliament; and that it cannot be entertained, even for a moment longer, at the close of the present. And this argument will appear the stronger when their lordships are aware, as I hope they will be aware, that in the midst of the crowded state of business in the Commons, the endless divisions of that body into committees, and of course the partial attendance of the members as a whole, fatigued, distracted, transferred from sitting to sitting, from subject to subject, the measure has really never obtained half the steady consideration which it ought to have done in the Lower House.

I am, sir, &c.,

A COUNTRY MAGISTRATE.

June 3.

#### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR.—At present the scheme for founding a new colony, and for creating a class of persons whom none but our friends and fellow-countrymen the "West Britons" can be privileged to call into existence, I mean non-resident emigrants, is so imperfectly developed, that it is not very easy to understand the motives of its projectors. One matter, however, there is, which is so intimately connected with the scheme, and which by its connexion therewith may be productive of consequences so mischievous, and ruinous, and fatal, that

I trust you will feel it your duty to put the public and the legislature on their guard by calling their attention specifically to it without delay.

I always believed that the Poor-Law Amendment Bill was itself a great job, and I have never ceased to suspect that, as Falstaff was at once witty himself and the cause of wit in others, so the Poor-Law Bill would be not only itself a job, but the means of a thousand other minor jobs, by which the concoctors and the supporters of the measure would thrive and flourish.

Among these subordinate pieces of trickery I never doubted that the emigration clauses were to be numbered, though I confess that their precise tendency was not until now made visible to me even "as in a glass darkly." The emigration clauses ran thus:

"And be it further enacted, that it shall and may be lawful for the rate-payers in any parish, and such of the owners of property therein as shall in manner hereinbefore mentioned, have required their names to be entered in the rate-books of such parishes respectively entitled to vote as owners, assembled at a meeting to be duly convened and held for the purpose, after public notice of the time and place of holding such meeting, and the purpose for which the same is intended to be held, shall have been given in like manner as notices of vestry meetings are published and given, to direct that such sum or sums of money as the said owners and rate-payers so assembled at such meeting may think proper, shall be raised or borrowed as a fund, or in aid of any fund or contribution for defraying the expenses of the emigration of poor persons having settlements in such parish and willing to emigrate, to be paid out of or charged upon the rates raised or to be raised for the relief of the poor in such parish, and to be applied under and according to such rules, orders, and regulations of the said commissioners shall, in that behalf, direct; provided always, that no such direction for raising money for such purpose as aforesaid shall

“ have any force or effect unless and  
 “ until confirmed by the said commis-  
 “ sioners, and that the time to be limited  
 “ for the repayment of any sum so  
 “ charged on such rates as aforesaid  
 “ shall in no case exceed the period of  
 “ five years from the time of borrowing  
 “ the same; provided also, that all  
 “ sums of money so raised, as last here-  
 “ inbefore mentioned, and advanced by  
 “ way of loan, for the purposes of emi-  
 “ gration, or such proportion thereof as  
 “ the said commissioners shall, by any  
 “ rule, order, or regulation, from time  
 “ to time direct, shall be recoverable  
 “ against any such person, being above  
 “ the age of 21 years, who or whose fa-  
 “ mily, or any part thereof, having con-  
 “ sented to emigrate, shall refuse to  
 “ emigrate after such expenses shall  
 “ have been so incurred, in such and  
 “ the like manner as is hereinbefore pro-  
 “ vided with respect to relief, or the  
 “ cost price of relief, given, or consider-  
 “ ed to be given, by way of loan to any  
 “ able-bodied person, his wife, or fa-  
 “ mily.

“ And be it further enacted, That  
 “ where it shall be lawful, under the pro-  
 “ visions of any of the herein recited acts,  
 “ or of any local act, or of this act, to  
 “ raise or borrow any sum or sums of  
 “ money for the purpose of purchasing,  
 “ building, altering, or enlarging any  
 “ workhouse or workhouses in any pa-  
 “ rish or union, or for purchasing land  
 “ whereon to build the same, or for de-  
 “ fraying the expenses of the emigra-  
 “ tion of poor persons having settle-  
 “ ments in any parish, and being will-  
 “ ing to emigrate, it shall be lawful for  
 “ the overseers or guardians of such  
 “ parish or union, with the consent of  
 “ the said commissioners, to be testified  
 “ under their hands and seal, to make  
 “ application for an advance of any sum  
 “ necessary for any such purposes to the  
 “ commissioners appointed under an  
 “ act made and passed in the 57. year  
 “ of the reign of his late Majesty King  
 “ George the Third, entitled ‘ An Act to  
 “ authorize the issue of Exchequer-  
 “ bills, and the Advance of Money out of  
 “ the Consolidated Fund, to a limited  
 “ amount, for the carrying on of pub-

“ lic works and fisheries in the United  
 “ Kingdom, and employment of the  
 “ poor in Great Britain in manner  
 “ therein-mentioned; and the said  
 “ Exchequer-bill Loan Commissioners  
 “ are hereby empowered to make such  
 “ advances, upon any such application  
 “ as aforesaid, upon the security of the  
 “ rates for the relief of the poor in such  
 “ parish or union, and without requiring  
 “ any further or other security than a  
 “ charge on such rates.”

No man even moderately acquainted with the condition of the country could for a moment hesitate to pronounce these most imprudent and most mischievous clauses. For years past the Parliament and the public have been stunned with bitter complaints that there should be added to the burdens of national taxation so heavy an additional burden, in the shape of local taxation, as 10,000,000*l.* a year. There are at present sitting committees of the House of Commons whose duty it is to consider how the weight of this local grievance can be alleviated. But what does this clause propose? Why, simply that to national taxation, and local taxation, and national debt, there shall be added parochial debt also. Each parish is not only to lend its shoulder to the support of the general burden of the state, but it is to have hung on to it its own individual bundle besides. It would be difficult to make such a nation as this break down; but if that work of destruction be ever achieved, it will be by adding new permanent weights to the several pillars that support the entire fabric.

In this point of view, then, any man who was not blinded by self-interest, or lured away from the plain beaten track by the will-o'-the-wisps of the poor-law commissioners into the filthy slough of political economy, must have rejected the clause.

But besides their own natural gift of common sense, our legislators had plain, palpable, and glaring beacons to warn them against these new and false lights; and I beg to remind the public, through your columns, what these beacons are.

There have been several committees

of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into emigration, and the evidence taken before those committees has established beyond all doubt these two points:

1. That our parishes are too heavily burdened to contribute towards the expenses of emigration.

2. That every vacuum created in England and Scotland by means of emigration must shortly be filled up by labourers from Ireland.

The second report of the emigration committee, which is dated the 5. of April, 1827, contains the following passage:

"Your committee by no means express their opinion that upon future occasions, and when the subject shall be better understood, funds may not be raised from parish-rates for the purpose of relieving themselves from the burden of their redundant population; on the contrary, they have had frequent applications to this specific effect." "But," adds the committee, "we deem it necessary in candour to state, that so far as our inquiries have gone the funds of the districts to which our present report alludes are so far exhausted, that no such assistance on their part can be fairly calculated upon."

What the committee intended by saying "when the subject shall be better understood," it will not be easy to discover, unless the expression have reference to the concluding passage of the same report, I mean the passage that regards the influx of Irish labourers into England and Scotland, and to which I have just adverted. It runs thus:

"Your committee cannot, however, conclude this report without expressing their deep conviction, that whatever may be the immediate and urgent demands from other quarters it is vain to hope for any permanent and extensive advantage from any system of emigration which does not primarily apply to Ireland, whose population, unless some other outlet be opened to them, must shortly fill up every vacuum created in England or

"in Scotland, and reduce the labouring classes to a uniform state of degradation and misery. And your committee therefore pledge themselves to devote their most anxious attention to the state of that country, and the practicability of applying emigration as a means of relieving it from its present overwhelming population."

This passage is repeated by the committee at the conclusion of their third report. The committee say, that "finally they beg in the strongest manner to confirm the opinion expressed in their second report at the earlier part of the present session, which states their deep conviction that whatever may be the immediate and urgent demands from other quarters, it is vain to hope for any permanent and extensive advantage from any system of emigration which does not primarily apply to Ireland, whose population, unless some other outlet be opened to them, must shortly fill up every vacuum created in England or in Scotland, and reduce the labouring classes to an uniform state of degradation and misery."

Now as Ireland is, at present at least, in an equally distressed condition as it was in 1827 (the date of this report), as no means have been taken to provide better for its population at home, or to withdraw any large portion of it by means of emigration or otherwise abroad, it must be quite clear that now, as in 1827, the vacuum created by emigration from England or Scotland would be shortly filled up by labourers from Ireland, and therefore that the money spent on English or Scotch emigration would be thrown away.

Upon the showing, therefore, of these emigration committees, the House of Commons is premature in applying the emigration scheme to England.

But they are worse than premature. They know that our own parishes are more heavily burdened now than they were in 1827; and yet the emigration committees tell us that the funds of parishes were then so much exhausted, as to be incapable of furnishing assistance to any plan of emigration. The House

of Commons, therefore, introduce the emigration experiment, not only too soon, but even with less prospect of advantage than existed at the period when these emigration committees refused to recommend that it should be tried.

Even this is not the extent of the folly and the mischief of the emigration clause; for, while the experiment is premature, rash, and dangerous, the clause not only admits its trial, but actually invites that trial. The clause, you will see, is not permissive only, it is persuasive. The emigration committees declare that though parish funds were exhausted, parishes would willingly have had recourse to emigration. This they could have done by borrowing, and only by borrowing; and loan-making under such circumstances the committees would not sanction, because they were at once honest and prudent men. They knew the money would not be repaid, and they knew, moreover, that it would be thrown away, because the Irish labourers would fill up the vacuum created by English and Scotch emigration. The emigration clause facilitates and tempts parishes to borrow by furnishing them a lender, and asking for no valid and satisfactory security.

Here for the present I pause; but, *liberare animam*, I must be allowed to express my suspicion that it is intended that this Joint-Stock Emigration Company and the emigration clause in the Poor-laws' Amendment should work together, and I therefore say to the public generally, "Take care of your pockets." Let it be recollected that though Mr. S. Rice, the present secretary for the colonies, has sanctioned the scheme, yet that a man much more shrewd at least, the late secretary for the colonies, Mr. Stanley, declared it to be his opinion that "it was impossible for any sane mind to entertain it without some private object of lucre or gain."

I ought to add, that I do not think the scheme one jot the less innocent because Mr. Gouger appears as secretary. Is it true, as reported, that Colonel Torrens is to be the governor of the new colony?

X. Y. Z.

We have received and publish to-day a letter respecting the new colony project, signed "X. Y. Z." which places that speculation in a new point of view. We may, on another occasion, enter into the matters discussed by our correspondent in his letter; but for the present we content ourselves with directing attention to the letter itself, as containing suggestions well worthy to be weighed, both as regards this colonizing crotchet and the Poor-Law Bill; for between these two absurdities our correspondent appears to us to have established something very like a close and intimate connexion.

We publish also another letter, bearing the signature of "A Country Magistrate," which is equally deserving of the consideration of our readers, and which also touches upon the joint-stock juggle for getting British paupers scalped by bushmen in Southern Australia. To one part of this letter of the "Country Magistrate" we are most desirous of calling attention, and it is that which refers to the Lord Chancellor's speech in favour of the Poor-Law Amendment Bill.

His lordship was pleased to tell the Peers, that in determining whether they would or would not pass the Poor-Law Amendment Bill, the question was, whether they would or would not take the measures necessary for preserving their estates. Even if Lord Brougham could make good that which, being notoriously at variance with fact and common sense, we defy him to make good—namely, that this bill will lessen the gross amount of money levied upon the community for poor-rates—still, no one will pretend that it can, by possibility, diminish that tax so far as to enable any lord to give his lady another jewel, or his stud another quadruped. Does Lord Brougham then think that, supposing this style of supporting the bill to be in good taste or in good judgment, the Lords are such people, that they will starve the poor for the purpose of saving themselves a few pence in the course of the year, and for the further purpose of supporting in competence twelve hangers-on of the Mi-

nisters who are to rejoice in the titles of Commissioners and Assistant-Commissioners with salaries varying from 1,000*l.* a year to an amount very little, if at all, less? Lord Brougham may depend upon it that the question is simply whether the Lords will support a large establishment at a certain expense, for the sake of the remote probability of diminishing the poor-rates by frightening the poor from applying for relief; and if it be true that the question of preserving or of losing their estates does arise in this matter of the Poor-Law Bill, it can arise only from a consideration of the fearful dangers to the life and property of all men which the passing of such a measure must necessarily create.

But, good heaven! what an appeal is this with which the Lord Chancellor by way of prologue ushers in what ought to be a calm deliberate discussion of a transcendently important subject! Can men, however high in station, take a cool dispassionate view of a subject, when at the very opening their fears are awakened for the loss of their estates? Is not this putting them under a sort of duress? Can men reason in a panic? We have been unjustly accused of using vehement language, and inflaming the minds of the poor against the rich. Is it more excusable to set the rich against the poor, and, in a case, too, where the rich are to be the judges of the cause of the poor men brought before them? Alas! that we should live to see such an argument proceeding from the lips of one whom the people have been taught to look upon, whom we have a thousand times taught them to look upon, as the friend of the poor.

But Lord Brougham also cautions the Peers against "parish jobbers and country agitators." Whatever Lord Brougham may condescend to think good sport for him, we have no hesitation in declaring that, for us, "parish jobbers" are in these times game much too small for our shot. We know of a preserve upon which we have a right to sport, and which abounds in much larger game, we mean Ministerial and Government jobbers; and to speak the truth, it oc-

cupies so much of our time to frighten them off the corn, that we have no leisure to look after the sparrows who peck at cherries in parishes. Let Lord Brougham only confine his inspection to the immediate sphere of the Government; and if he desires to put down jobbers, he will find quite enough to do there from his own personal observation, without declaiming, upon the authority of others about parochial peculators, of whom he can know nothing, and who at their highest, are not, his lordship may be assured, big enough to be made stalking-horses, that will cover the approaches of poor-law poachers who have persuaded the House of Commons that, instead of being what they really are, mere poachers for their own personal benefit, their character is that of game preservers for the country gentlemen. If this poor-law job succeed, we think the Prince Hohenloe, or the fire king, or any other juggler, who failed, will have reason to consider himself an ill-used person, for the legerdmain of neither of these persons was so palpable as this is.

As to "country agitators," we say nothing. If the bill should pass, we are quite sure that Daniel O'Connell must hide his diminished head before our Ministers, who will have become agitators of the first water, as the state of the country before Christmas next will unhappily prove, without any reasoning of ours. In this sense, and in this sense only, we tell the Peers that the question is, "whether or not they will take the measure necessary for preserving their estates"; but we would not have said this, or aught else which our bitterest enemy could have construed into an attempt at dictation or intimidation (and we really mean it not to be either), if the example had not been set us in so high a quarter, and forced us to put forward the real unvarnished state of the case.

Let the Lords only take time to consider the bill, and we have no doubt as to the result of their deliberations.

## THE POOR-LAWS BILL.

*(From the Times, 7. July, 1834.)*

On Saturday a meeting of the vestry of the parish of St. Marybonne took place at the Court-house, for the purpose of receiving the report of the committee appointed to examine the Poor-Laws Bill, now waiting for a second reading in the House of Lords, and to consider how far it would be advisable to forward a petition to that branch of the legislature, praying their lordships not to pass the bill. The meeting was fully attended, and amongst those present were, Lord Kenyon, the Rev. Dr. Spry, rector of the parish, Sir Samuel Whalley, John Smith, Esq., M.P., Captain Brenton, &c.

Captain WARDELL was in the chair, and after some local matters were disposed of, the report of the committee on the Poor-Laws Bill was brought up and read. It stated that the committee had proceeded to examine the bill, but, as a former committee had already reported on the principal provisions it contained, and more particularly with reference to the law of settlement, and the bastardy clauses, they did not think it necessary to repeat the objections which were then stated, but they begged to draw the particular attention of the vestry to the proposed appointment of a central board of commissioners, to which they strongly objected as arbitrary and unconstitutional.

On the motion of Mr. Wilson, the report was ordered to be received and adopted.

Mr. WILSON then rose to move that a petition be forthwith prepared and forwarded to the House of Lords against the bill. (Applause). He observed that his objections to the bill, so far from being decreased by the amendments it had undergone in the House of Commons, were stronger than before, for he could not but consider that the measure in its amended shape was open to still greater objections than when it was originally brought forward. The bill had now passed the House of Commons, and as an early day had been appointed for the second reading in the House of Lords, he conceived that no time ought

to be lost, but that the vestry were bound to forward a petition to their lordships, stating their objections to that most atrocious bill. He regretted that there was no time to get up a public meeting, for he felt convinced that if there had, the whole parish of Marybonne would come forward as one man to condemn the measure. He was happy to find, however, that the bill would be opposed in the House of Lords, and he hoped that the opposition would take place on the second reading, and that their lordships would not allow the bill to go into committee. He considered that the whole principle of the measure was centred in the appointment of the board of commissioners, and he therefore trusted that the opposition of the House of Lords would be directed against that particular point. The commissioners were appointed by the preamble of the bill, and, in fact, the whole measure turned upon that appointment. If, therefore, the commissioners were taken away, the measure would be nugatory, and the bill must fall to the ground. He did not deny that some slight improvements had been made in the bill, but the worst features of the measure still remained, and he for one would never consent to the monstrous proposition that a board of three commissioners should ride rough shod over the 15,000 parishes of England and Wales. (Hear, hear). He was surprised to think that such a bill could have been passed by a reformed House of Commons, and that the principal opposition which it met with there was from the Tory members, who were generally supposed to desire that the prerogative of the crown should be extended, however they might interfere with the interests of the people. In speaking of the petitions which had been forwarded against the bill by local boards, Lord Althorpe had rather disingenuously stated that these petitions contained only 9,000 signatures, and from this circumstance the noble lord wished to draw the inference that the people generally were in favour of his bill: but it should be recollected that the persons who forwarded those petitions were the repre-

representatives of large bodies of persons, whose feelings and opinions were conveyed through them. The Lord Chancellor, too, on referring to these petitions in the House of Lords, had preferred a most unfair charge, for he said it was true there were petitions against the bill, but they had emanated from parish jobbers and persons interested in continuing the old system of corruption and abuse. Now, he would ask, was that the way in which the petitions of the people ought to be treated by the first subject in the realm? (Hear, hear). He would only say that if he were one of the persons so represented by the noble and learned lord, he would throw back the charge with the disdain which it merited. That noble and learned functionary had also told their lordships, that in viewing the bill they ought to look to their own interests, for of this he was satisfied, that if they rejected the measure, their estates would no longer be secure under the present system. Now, so far from that, he (Mr. Wilson), on the contrary, believed that their lordships' estates would be in far greater danger if the bill now before them should be passed into a law; for he anticipated nothing from it but heartburning, violence, and bloodshed. He then referred to the evidence taken before the poor-law commissioners, on which the bill was founded, and contended that the statements made by the majority of the witnesses had been subsequently proved to be false. He particularly alluded to the evidence of Mr. Richmond, of the parish of St. Luke, which had been flatly contradicted by the authorities of that place; and after mentioning other instances, he observed, that such was the evidence and such the proof on which the House of Commons had acted, and, on which the Lord Chancellor and the hon. member for Middlesex had founded charges of self-interest and corruption against the parochial authorities who had felt it their duty to oppose the bill. He believed that the measure, if it should unfortunately pass, would never be brought into operation in the parish of Marybonne, but he felt

bound, notwithstanding, to give it all the opposition in his power. After alluding to the extraordinary powers given to the commissioners, he contended that the parochial authorities would be but mere tools in the hands of those persons. Certain clauses in the bill directed that the votes of parishioners should be taken from house to house by persons acting under the commissioners, and appointed for that purpose. Now, he would ask why was such a provision introduced, if not for the purpose of packing parish boards to procure majorities in favour of such measures as the commissioners should think fit to adopt? (Hear, hear). Then came the system of voting by proxy, which gave the power to persons residing abroad of delegating others to vote for them. He contended that if this principle were allowed, parish boards would be completely swamped by proxy votes, and there would at once be an end to the free exercise of opinion. The political economists having failed in extending their favourite principle of emigration, were now desirous of forwarding their schemes by means of the Poor-Laws Bill, and their great anxiety was to apply a portion of the poor-rates to effect their object. Witness the late meeting of the South Australian Company, who were no doubt desirous to dip into the funds of the parish poor in order to transport people from their native country. They saw the opening which was offered to them of putting into execution their long-cherished plans, and no doubt they would gladly avail themselves of it if the Poor-Laws Bill were to pass. But was this the way, he would ask, that the landed interest was to be relieved by diminishing the poor-rates? He contended that in all those parishes where the principle of representation had been applied the evils of the poor-laws had been considerably ameliorated, and the poor-rates reduced in proportion; and he therefore argued that there was no necessity for the bill, inasmuch as the evils of the existing system were likely to be generally abated without the intervention of a law so arbitrary and unjust in principle, and so

repugnant to the feelings of Englishmen. In conclusion, he produced a petition to the House of Lords which he had drawn up for the purpose, and in moving its adoption by the vestry, he earnestly hoped that their lordships would act upon the suggestions it contained, and throw out the bill on the second reading. (Applause).

The petition was then read, and the motion seconded by Mr. Savage.

Dr. SPRY, the rector, then rose and said he fully agreed in the propriety of forwarding this petition to the House of Lords, although he had objected to a similar petition to the House of Commons, because he had hoped that the bill would have been so amended in the committee of that House as to render remonstrance unnecessary. He was sorry to say, however, that the bill had not been at all improved; and as it was the duty of the vestry to protect the rights of the poor, he felt that they were now called upon to do so. (Hear, hear). He suggested, however, that the wording of the petition in one or two instances ought to be altered. He alluded to the passage in which it was stated that the objects of the promoters of the bill was "to oppress the poor and drive them from the country." He did not think that those were the objects of the bill, although it was calculated certainly to produce such effects. (Hear, hear). He considered also that it would be better to object generally to the alterations made in the bill by the committee of the House of Commons than to suggest that the local boards should have the sole management and control over their respective parishes. His hope and belief was, that in consequence of the inquiry which had been set on foot, and the general attention which the question of the poor-laws had excited, the country was now so alive to the evils of the present system, that if it was left to itself for twelve months a material change would be effected for the better. (Hear, hear, hear). He was perfectly satisfied of the truth and justice of this principle, that when evils had arisen in a wide-spreading system connected with the social habits of the people, it was always

the safer and better course to allow the people by their own good sense to right themselves, than to endeavour to force them to do so by legislative enactments. (Hear, hear). With that impression he was extremely anxious that the bill should at once be thrown out by the House of Lords, and he was satisfied that the moral remedy to which he had alluded would soon follow. As to the observation that the bill, if passed, would not apply to the parish of Mary-bonne, or to those other parishes in which a reform had already taken place, he would only say that the bill, when once passed, would be equally applicable to all parishes, although he did not mean to say that the commissioners would be over anxious to apply it to the parish of Marybonne in particular; but there was nothing in the bill to prevent them from doing so whenever they might think proper, and he believed that if the commissioners could once manage to put a finger on the funds of the poor, their whole hands would soon follow. It was idle, therefore, to suppose that any one parish would be exempted from the operation of the bill. The rev. gentleman concluded by repeating his approval of the petition, with the exception of the passage to which he had referred.

Mr. WILSON said he was quite willing, in compliance with the suggestion of the rev. rector, to expunge from the petition the words which he had pointed out.

Mr. NELMES then rose to propose an amendment. He defended the principle of the bill, and said if he could once bring himself to believe that its effects would be to oppress and grind down the poor, he hoped he had sufficient humanity to raise his voice against it. In his opinion, however, the effect of the bill would be precisely the reverse, for its object was to relieve the poor from the abject misery and distress in which they were plunged, owing to the operation of a pernicious system of poor-laws, which refused relief to this independent and honest labourer, and bestowed it on the profligate and idle pauper. He considered that the bill

was a benevolent measure, and he had heard nothing that in his opinion weighed against it, either from any member of that board or elsewhere. The various parochial boards would still exist as before the passing of the bill, subject only to a controlling power, which he considered to be absolutely necessary, to prove which he read various extracts from the report of the commissioners, showing that under the present system the parishes, particularly in the rural districts, had remained nearly stationary for the last 50 years, as the authorities felt no inclination to amend the abuses which time and bad management had introduced into them. It was therefore necessary, he contended, that a controlling power should exist to purify existing abuses, and compel indolent parish officers to do their duty. The commissioners would interfere only in such cases. He concluded by moving an amendment to the effect, that as Government had brought forward the Poor-Laws Amendment Bill, in order to afford better security for life, liberty, and property, the vestry hoped the House of Lords would pass the bill without delay.

Mr. EDWARDS seconded the motion, and contended at some length that the bill had been considerably improved by the committee of the House of Commons, in compliance with the suggestions of those who opposed it. The Tory party had been lauded because they had lent a hand to throw out this "atrocious" measure, as it had been called. The Tories, however, were not in this instance entitled to the praises which had been lavished upon them, for everybody knew that they would oppose any measure of the present Government. He considered that the suggestion of the worthy rector, that the bill should stand over for a year, was founded in good sense, but he at the same time felt that the bill had now gone so far that it was impossible to stop its progress, and when he recalled to mind the men who had supported it in the House of Commons, and who had always advocated the right of the poor on other occasions, he confessed that if he

had any scruples himself upon the subject, the support which those gentlemen had given to the measure was calculated to remove them.

Sir S. WHALLEY commenced by observing that one would suppose, from what had fallen from the mover and seconder of the amendment, that the bill contained all that was good, without the mixture of any one bad quality. He was far from believing, however, that any good would flow from the measure to counteract the evils with which it abounded. He was willing to admit, however, that the bill had been considerably improved, and that it was no longer the vile and atrocious measure that it was when it was first brought forward. He would say, that if any copy of the original bill should exist in after years, it would be sufficient to damn the Whigs for ever. (Hear, hear). The Tories had been taunted for not having brought forward liberal measures when they were in power. But the Tories dared not—nay, he believed they would not, have brought forward such a measure as that, although they took their stand upon the principle of supporting the aristocracy and the crown, and preventing encroachments upon either. In the instance of this bill, however, the Tories had shown that they were ready to resist also an encroachment on the rights of the people. (Applause). The hon. Gentleman then proceeded to describe the various alterations which the bill had undergone in the committee of the House of Commons, many of which he considered to have improved the measure, but he complained that the exact nature of the amendments could not be ascertained, as they had not been printed, although the bill had been read a third time and passed, a mode of proceeding which he believed to be contrary to all practice. The bill had certainly been improved, but although so far it was not liable to all the objections entertained against the original measure, he still felt an insuperable repugnance to it. Lord Althorp told the landed interest when the measure was first brought forward, that he meant it as a

boon to them, because it would reduce the poor-rates; but he (Sir S. Whalley) confessed he could not bring his mind to think in what way the bill could produce that effect. He believed that the original object of the bill was to refuse all relief to the poor unless they consented to live within the walls of the workhouse. He contended that, as the bill now stood, it would increase rather than diminish the poor-rates, because the natural result of the measure would be to raise the price of labour; and he was sure that it would produce great distress, heartburnings, and resistance, amongst the lower classes, because it would tend to snap asunder the links by which the humbler classes were united to the higher, and the poor would thus believe that the richer classes, to whom they naturally looked up for support, had cast them off for ever. He agreed with the rev. rector that this bill ought to be delayed until the people had time to examine its provisions. The report of the commissioners had been so far beneficial as to induce many parishes to act upon their suggestions and reform themselves, and by waiting another session the example already set might be generally followed. He denied that the board of commissioners would not have the power of interfering with local boards, for they would issue general orders, and every parish would be bound to obey them. He was convinced, however, that the commissioners would find themselves beset by so many difficulties, that they could not go on. For instance, it would be extremely difficult for them to frame rules and regulations for the general guidance of parishes without interfering with some existing act of Parliament. He believed that every parish in the kingdom that had not a local act of Parliament of its own would be laid prostrate at the feet of the central board of commissioners. This would be the result as regarded the rural parishes; and general misery and discontent would surely follow. He contended, that with every disposition to do good, it would still be impossible that any one board of commissioners sitting

in London could manage in a satisfactory manner the local details of distant parishes. He therefore entertained the greatest objection to the appointment of such a board, which he agreed in considering the main feature and principle of the bill, and hence his continued hostility to it. He remembered, when the Slave Emancipation Bill passed the House of Commons, that Mr. Stanley, the then Secretary for the Colonies, declared that it would be impossible to carry it through Parliament, unless the consent of the local authorities in the West Indies was previously obtained, and that consent was obtained accordingly. Now, he would ask, why had not the same principle been applied to the Poor-Laws Bill? (Hear, hear). The poorer classes as yet knew nothing, or hardly any thing, of the present measure; but when they became acquainted with its nature, and felt the misery and degradation to which it would subject them—when they learned that they must expect to be relieved no longer by those to whom they were used to look up to for assistance and advice, and that they would be thrown on the tender mercies of a heartless board of commissioners, their hopes would sink at once, general discontent and despair would follow, which would break out into overt acts, and the country would then have the misery of witnessing once more those scenes of lawless riot, burnings, trials, and executions, which were exhibited not long since. (Hear, hear).

Mr. JACKSON contended that the preponderance of weight and talent in the House of Commons was in favour of the bill. (No, no). To prove that his statement was correct, let any man look at the divisions that had taken place, and he would find that the great majority of the most eminent in that assembly had voted for the bill. He was aware that there was one distinguished exception, and that Sir Francis Burdett had given a conscientious vote against it, but he believed that his was the only distinguished name that would be found in the minority. (No, no). Their respected member, Sir S. Whalley, even

he had said that the bill was considerably improved, and that, in fact, it was no longer the same measure. Now, he believed that if the hon. member would speak out, he would say that the bill was a good bill. He owned he felt some degree of surprise to hear the hon. member say, that the effect of the powers given to the board of commissioners would be to oppress the poor.

Sir S. WHALLEY.—I beg to observe that I said no such thing. I said that the effect of the bill would be to snap asunder those links by which the poorer classes were united to the higher, to whom they naturally looked up for support.

Mr. JACKSON said he understood the hon. member to have condemned the bill for not allowing the local board to grant relief to the poor out of the work-house.

Sir S. WHALLEY.—I said I believed that such a plan as that was originally intended.

Mr. JACKSON then proceeded to speak in favour of the bill, and after remarking on the singularity of seeing Tories and Radicals join their forces to throw out the bill, he observed that if the measure should be defeated the vestry might be assured that they would never see another government in the country who would have the courage to propose such a bill. (Hear, hear, and laughter).

Mr. POTTER said that nearly all the Irish and Scotch members voted against the bill, and he hoped to see the House of Lords make a bold stand against it. (Hear, hear). The vestry had been taunted with inconsistency because, after having condemned the House of Lords on other occasions, it now sought their support, in order to get rid of the bill. Now where was the inconsistency in blaming men when they acted wrong and giving them due praise when they happened to act right? For his own part he was not altogether in love with the House of Lords. He condemned the plan which they had of voting by proxy, and of allowing spiritual peers to interfere in secular matters; but he would not therefore say that the House of Lords were always in the wrong, and

that they might not, as on this occasion he hoped they would, act for the general good of the people when an opportunity arose for doing so. With regard to the Tories generally, whatever might be their political faults, they were good landlords, and it could not be denied their purses were always open to the poor. (Hear, hear). He attributed the bill to the overweening desire of the Government to get patronage into their hands. After alluding at considerable length to the various provisions of the bill, and commenting on their tendency, he concluded by hoping that the petition would be carried, and that the noble peer who was present (Lord Kenyon) would not only give it his support, but state the feeling which prevailed generally in the parish with respect to the bill. (Hear, hear).

Mr. HOVENDON (the barrister) then proceeded to address the vestry. He observed, that however bad the machinery of the old system of poor-laws might be, that was no reason why the country should be called upon to sanction the machinery of the present bill. He did not mean to say that the measure had not been improved by the alteration it had received in the committee of the House of Commons, but the bill must still undergo far greater alterations; for although he was satisfied that an alteration for the better had taken place, yet of this he was equally sure—that no three Englishmen would be found to approve of it as it at present stood. He therefore hoped that the House of Lords would throw it out at once, or so alter it as to render its provisions less obnoxious to the people. The learned gentleman then proceeded to enumerate the several clauses in the amended bill which had been altered, when

The CHAIRMAN said the learned gentleman was out of order, as the questions before the vestry had reference to the petition, and the amendment moved upon it, and not to the details of the bill.

Captain BREXTON was of opinion that the bill was calculated to mend the condition of the poorer classes. If a

central board were established, to-morrow, he was quite sure that it would not act in the arbitrary way that some gentlemen appeared to anticipate. As a guardian of the poor he had no idea of a sturdy fellow coming to his house and telling him that he would have money. He contended that farmers in the country were laid at the feet of insolent impostors, who actually dared to threaten if they did not obtain all that they demanded. Such a system must be put a stop to, or the industrious occupiers of land would be compelled to abandon their homes,

Mr. METCALF said—What! is the vestry of Marybonne to set up their opinion against that of a majority of the House of Commons? For himself, he could not think of doing so, and he should therefore support the amendment.

Lord KENYON then rose to say a few words on this most important subject; but first he wished to set himself right both with the vestry, of which he was a member, and the public, with regard to the motives by which he was actuated in commenting in that place on a measure which he should have occasion to remark upon elsewhere. He should indeed feel ashamed if, in discussing a question in which the country at large was so deeply interested, he should allow himself to be influenced by any factious or unworthy motive, or any feeling whatever but the good of the country; and whether the present bill proceeded from Whig, Radical, or Tory, he should feel ashamed if he did not openly express his opinion upon it, and give his vote according to the dictates of his honour and his conscience. (Hear, hear). He considered the question as one wholly divested of party feeling, and would treat it as such. He did not think that any alteration which the bill was capable of undergoing could remove his objections to the establishment of the proposed central board of commissioners in whose hands a dangerous degree of power would be vested, and he considered that the whole plan embraced in the Poor-Laws Amendment Bill was founded on the views of

political economists, and, he did not mean to use the term offensively, visionary schemers, who endeavoured to subvert the wise and charitable enactments of Elizabeth, for laws suited to their own peculiar views. He was fully aware that abuses existed in the present system of poor-laws, but at the same time he was not aware that any man could justly say that he had been wronged or oppressed by that system. But the more immediate point for consideration, in his opinion, was this: would it be desirable that the control over the poor, and the funds applicable to their relief, should be taken out of the hands of the parochial authorities, and placed in those of a board of commissioners residing in London, who might, at pleasure, be reduced from three commissioners to one only, and who, notwithstanding, would have the entire management of every parish in the country? He considered that it would be wrong to place the poor under such management, and thus induce them to believe that they were no longer countenanced and supported by the rich. As far as his experience as a magistrate went, either in the counties of Sussex or Flint, he never knew an instance of a poor man applying for relief to the magistrates who did not feel grateful on receiving such assistance as his necessities appeared to require. Now, all the better feelings of the poor would be at once destroyed, if a board of commissioners sitting in the metropolis were to take out of the hands of parish officers in the country the power of dispensing relief. He considered that if such a system were acted upon the poor would at once be driven to emigration. He considered that the feelings of the people ought to be consulted on a subject in which their interests were so vitally concerned. Under these circumstances he should be extremely sorry that the bill should pass in its present shape, and he did not think it would be materially altered in committee. He was therefore most anxious that it should stand over, in order that all the evidence produced might be fully and fairly sifted and examined by the public, and he

had no doubt but that great good would result by the adoption of such a course. (Applause.)

After a few words from Mr. Savage and Mr. Green,

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment, which was negatived, there being but six hands held up for it.

The original motion was then put, and a division being insisted on, the numbers were,

For the petition.....34

Against it . . . . . 2

Majority.....—32

It was then moved by Mr. Wilson, and seconded, that the Right Hon. Lord Kenyon be requested to present the petition to the House of Lords on Tuesday next, and that his Lordship be requested to support the same.

Lord KENYON said he accepted the trust with pleasure, and would endeavour to induce other noble lords to join him in opposing the bill.

Thanks were then voted to the Chairman, and the vestry broke up.

(From the *True Sun*.)

Mr. COBBETT has devoted almost the whole of his last *Register* to the subject of emigration, and the *True Sun* comes in for a pretty good share of the abuse heaped upon the projectors of the proposed colony at Spencer's Gulf. Mr. COBBETT is pleased to charge us with *puffing* this project, and aiding and abetting a deceit upon the labouring classes. Mr. COBBETT, however, has permitted his passion to blind his judgment, as he may see by a reference to the articles upon which his charges are founded. We have said nothing in favour of the new project, beyond what the excellency of the principle upon which the colony is to be founded, and the apparently open and ingenuous mode of proceeding adopted by the committee extorted from us. We recommended that a fair hearing should be given to the *exposé* promised at Exeter-hall, and that the objects of the committee should be judged of by that. This may be *puffing* in Mr. COBBETT's estimation, but it is not so in ours.

Mr. COBBETT contrasts our remarks upon the emigration project, with our expressed sympathy for the working-classes, in order to deduce an inference against our consistency. But in truth, there is no inconsistency. Our opinions are the same on the subject of emigration as they always were. We are still as strongly opposed to the plan of taxing one portion of the community to enable us to transport another, as we ever were. We still denounce the idea, that parishes should be allowed to force men to expatriate themselves by a threat of refusing relief if they remain here. We still execrate that policy of our rulers which leads them to the endeavour of keeping down the number of the population here, by any and all means, to just that amount which will serve to render them submissive and tractable; and consequently we have opposed and shall continue to oppose all schemes founded upon these principles. But, do we, therefore, wish to render England one wide prison, from which the labourer, heart-sick at the sight of oppression and weary with the struggle for subsistence, shall never be able to escape, however bright may seem the prospect afforded to him by other lands? Do we desire that there shall be no outlet for those whose only prospect here is misery and starvation? No. We wish that whatever freedom the laws may allow Englishmen should be theirs, that they should be free to go and free to stay, as they may deem most consistent with their interest. We do hope and believe that a time may come when England will be worth living in, and we even believe that such a change may arrive within a very few years. Let those, then, who can stay, remain, and indulge a hope of better times, which even their remaining may serve to hasten; but if the condition of any here be unbearable, or if they are strongly moved by the hopes which a colony offers of immediate comfort and ultimate independence, we say to them, go; and we hail the assistance of any one to enable them to carry their wishes into effect.

It is on these grounds that we rejoice

in the sanction which the proposed colony has received from Government. No force can, under this plan, be exerted to compel any to emigrate; and on those who have possessed the inclination, but have hitherto lacked the ability to avail themselves of the prospects which emigration may appear to hold out, it will confer a great and permanent good, if those guarantees against jobbing which have been promised by the projectors be but fully realized; and we are, at all events, called upon to give them a fair trial.

### LONDON MARKETS.

**MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, July 7.**—The arrivals of Wheat and other grain from Essex and Kent as well as Suffolk, have been moderate; those of Wheat, however, proved more than adequate to the demand, the millers purchasing with reluctance the better qualities at the rates of this day se'nnight, while secondary and inferior parcels barely supported the previous quotations.

Some Kubanka Wheat in bond sold at 32s. for export.

There were few samples of Barley offering, and both distillery and grinding sorts fully maintained last week's currency. For bonded qualities we heard of no inquiries, and prices must be considered almost nominal.

Malt hangs on hand, even the better qualities, though prices are unaltered.

The arrival of English, Scotch, or Irish Oats since Friday have not been large, but several cargoes have been received from abroad. Dealers and consumers evinced little disposition to purchase, and the trade ruled dull at the prices of last Monday, except where vessels required clearing, when rather lower terms were acceded to. A few sales of bonded samples were effected, at about 13s. at which rates tolerably good feed parcels might be obtained.

Beans did not attract much attention, and the quotations unaltered. Bonded qualities might have been bought at rather cheaper terms.

Peas are scarce, and boiling qualities worth rather more money than on Monday; in maple and grey no alteration but prices firm. In bond high rates are being demanded for good samples, say 38s. to 40s.

The Flour trade is steady, and fresh country marks saleable at former prices, as the supply is limited, owing to many mills being prevented from working in consequence of the want of water.

Fresh ship marks of Flour were saleable at last week's currency.

Wheat, Essex, Kent, and Suffolk	44s. to 50s.
— White .....	48s. to 55s.
— Norfolk, Lincolushire, and Yorkshire.....	40s. to 46s.
— White, ditto .....	44s. to 51s.
— West Country red.....	41s. to 47s.
— White, ditto .....	48s. to 50s.
— Northumberland and Berwickshire red ..	38s. to 44s.
— White, ditto .....	40s. to 46s.
— Moray, Angus, and Rothshire red.....	36s. to 42s.
— White, ditto .....	42s. to 44s.
— Irish red .....	36s. to 40s.
— White, ditto .....	38s. to 43s.
Barley, Malting .....	30s. to 32s.
— Chevalier .....	30s. to 32s.
— Distilling .....	29s. to 30s.
— Grinding.....	27s. to 29s.
Malt, new .....	37s. to 47s.
— Norfolk, pale.....	50s. to 56s.
— Ware .....	52s. to 58s.
Peas, Hog and Grey .....	38s. to 40s.
— Maple .....	39s. to 43s.
— White Boilers .....	45s. to 49s.
Beans, Small .....	33s. to 38s.
— Harrow .....	32s. to 37s.
— Tick.....	31s. to 35s.
Oats, English Feed .....	23s. to 25s.
— Short, small .....	24s. to 26s.
— Poland .....	23s. to 26s.
— Scotch, common .....	23s. to 25s.
— — Potato .....	26s. to 28s.
— — Berwick .....	25s. to 27s.
— Irish, Galway, &c. ....	22s. to 23s.
— — Potato .....	23s. to 25s.
— — Black .....	23s. to 24s.
Bran, per 16 bushels .....	10s. to 13s.
Flour, per sack .....	43s. to 46s.

### RADICAL PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

**THE CARTWRIGHT CLUB** and Visitors hold their next Anniversary Dinner on Monday, the 21. July instant, at Highbury-barn Tavern, Islington, to celebrate the memory of that truly honest and real Reformer, Major Cartwright,

**WILLIAM COBBETT, ESQ, M.P.,**  
IN THE CHAIR.

Tickets 5s. each (dessert included) may be had of Mr. Nicholson, 15, Fenchurch-street; Mr. George Rogers, 58, High-street, St. Giles's; at the bar of the Tavern; and of

**THOMAS CLEARY, HON. SEC.**  
12, Alfred-place, Bedford-square.

N.B. As the Tickets are limited an early application is recommended.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.